D2EFWEBS Sentence 1 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK 2 3 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, 4 V. 11 CR 424 (NRB) 5 MAYER WEBER, 6 Defendant. -----x 7 8 New York, N.Y. February 14, 2013 9 4:00 p.m. 10 Before: 11 HON. NAOMI REICE BUCHWALD, 12 District Judge 13 14 **APPEARANCES** 15 PREET BHARARA United States Attorney for the Southern District of New York 16 JAMES J. PASTORE, JR. 17 Assistant United States Attorney 18 HAFITZ NECHLIS & ROCCO Attorneys for Defendant 19 SUSAN NECHLIS, ESQ. NOAH SHELANSKI, ESQ. 20 21 22 23 24 25

1 (Case called) 2 (In open court) 3 THE DEPUTY CLERK: United States v. Mayer Weber. 4 Counsel, please state your appearances for the record. 5 MR. PASTORE: Jim Pastore for the United States. Good 6 afternoon, your Honor. 7 MS. NECHLIS: Susan Nechlis and Noah Shelanski for 8 Mr. Weber, who is also present. 9 THE COURT: Let me begin as I always do to confirm 10 that I've actually received all the documents in connection 11 with the sentencing that I should have. First there's the report of the probation office which bears a cover memo date to 12 13 me February 7, 2013. Then there is the sentencing submission 14 submitted by defense counsel which is accompanied by 130 15 letters on behalf of Mr. Weber and finally at my request I received this morning the financial statement that Mr. Weber 16 17 had not provided to the probation department. Actually, 18 looking at this I do not see a CC to the United States 19 Attorney. 20 MS. NECHLIS: I think we sent it to probation. 21 could certainly provide a copy. 22 THE COURT: Why don't, if you have an extra on you or 23 I can ask one of my clerks to make a copy. 24 MS. NECHLIS: I apologize. 25 THE COURT: All right. Let me give Mr. Pastore a few

D2EFWEBS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

minutes to flip through it. While he does that let me just ask are there any other documents I should have received in connection with the sentencing?

MS. NECHLIS: No, your Honor.

THE COURT: Let me just confirm that you have received the report of the probation department and had an opportunity to review it with your client.

MS. NECHLIS: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: Do you have any objections to it?

MS. NECHLIS: No, your Honor.

MR. PASTORE: The government also does not have any objections.

(Pause)

MR. PASTORE: Thank you. We've reviewed the financial disclosure.

THE COURT: Thank you. I'd like to begin by asking the government to detail for me the evidence against Mr. Weber. Specifically, having sat through the trial of four other defendants in this case I'm in a somewhat better position to formulate the precise questions and specifically I would at least like to know, and you can tell me what else you think is important, I would like to know the number of applications that were filed with Mr. Weber, a company of his being a sponsor. would also like to know what evidence there is relating to calls from the Department of Labor to Mr. Weber's companies

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

which would indicate contact between him and the Department of Labor and also whatever information you can provide with respect to how much money he earned from participating in this fraud.

MR. PASTORE: Yes, your Honor. In preparing for today's sentencing we looked not only at some of those questions but also just tried to get a sense of where Mr. Weber fit relative to the other defendants that your Honor has already sentenced and that have also been sentenced by other judges in related cases.

In terms of the number of applications, the total potential universe, and I put it that way because unlike the defendants who went to trial we did not do the same deep dive on the applications that were associated with Mr. Weber's companies, in other words, the call notes, for example. We pulled those only for defendants that were going to trial. total possible number of applications associated with Mr. Weber were 305, associated with 219 aliens. Now, because -- we do not believe, and consistent with our plea agreement, we do not believe he is accountable for that high of a number. Obviously, as I mentioned, there was not as much done to vet that number as compared to the defendants who went to trial. So we reached a negotiated plea agreement here and the parties agreed that there were between 25 -- there were at least 25 to 99 applications that Mr. Weber was responsible for and so --

D2EFWEBS Sentence

THE COURT: When you say -- I think you said there were 305 applications, that was the maximum number associated with how many aliens?

MR. PASTORE: 219. And I hesitate because when I say the maximum and the total potential universe, as your Honor heard from both cooperating witnesses sometimes companies would, applications would be submitted and the sponsor would not be fully informed of what was going on, they would essentially sign off on generally what was going on, but they weren't asked to sign each and every application. And so ultimately in this case with respect to Mr. Weber we ultimately determined that 25 to 99 was an appropriate number to hold him accountable for, that there was no doubt and both parties agreed and wouldn't contest that he was responsible for at least between 25 and 99 applications. So a significant number.

But Mr. Weber's involvement went a little deeper than that. There was a post office box that he opened to which fraudulent applications and mail associated with fraudulent applications was directed. And we know that he opened that P.O. box because we have the rental application associated with it. We also know that he controlled several businesses. Your Honor heard and probably recalls testimony about nursing homes that were used in the fraud. Indeed, as cooperating witness David Greenstein testified, Mr. Weber and he engaged in additional criminal conduct in the form of a company that

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Mr. Weber at least partially owned that was separate but related to their law firm. Your Honor may remember that Mr. Greenstein filed two additional fraudulent applications and that was with Mr. Weber, with Mr. David. Now, of course Mr. Weber at the time that those additional applications had been filed, he had not yet been charged so this isn't additional criminal conduct for him, this is part and parcel. But I think that makes him differently situated than the other defendants your Honor has seen in this case because he went on to do other applications as part of the fraud, it's covered by his plea agreement, but he did it essentially with David Greenstein and with Earl David even after Earl David had left for Canada.

And so what emerges is although he was a minor player in the sense that he was not in the law firm, and we're certainly not backing away from the minor role adjustment, we gave it to him, he was not one of the law firm people and I think that was sort of the dividing line. I also think the guidelines in this case strike the government as reasonable. As your Honor knows, the guidelines are 10 to 16 months and it could be satisfied by supervised release that includes a condition of home confinement as long as at least half of the time is spent in prison, at least five months. And when you look at the other defendants who have been sentenced, you look at Mr. Flohr, for example, and the application numbers there,

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

D2EFWEBS Sentence

much lower, 40 applications was the total potential universe for 30 aliens, and in fact there was a different guidelines range, it was guidelines range where the offense level was 10, which means that defendant Flohr was actually in zone B as opposed to zone C. So it's sort of doubly significant in the sense that it was a totally different quideline range and a totally different zone, zone B instead of zone C, which as your Honor knows can be satisfied by the guidelines by a term of no imprisonment at all, instead home confinement alone is a quideline sentence.

When you look at Mr. Walter, that's probably a person that Mr. Weber is most closely associated with, but even there there are differences. Mr. Walter was potentially responsible for 198 applications associated with 163 aliens, but Mr. Walter had a slightly different way into this fraud. He owed Mr. Teitlebaum money. There was no evidence, at least that the government was aware of, that the fraudulent applications were going to P.O. boxes that he himself had opened. Instead, all of the P.O. boxes that we identified associated with Mr. Walter's companies were actually controlled by Mr. Teitlebaum or others in the fraud and then we come to Ms. Urbanek who actually was more involved. She was in the law firm, as your Honor knows, but as your Honor heard and I won't go into it in detail here, she had significant personal circumstances, and in reading Mr. Weber's sentencing

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

submission, I don't mean to suggest that he doesn't have a lot of support, he clearly does, and there were an extraordinary number of at least in my experience an extraordinary number of exhibits and letters submitted on his behalf, but at the same time it just did not strike the government -- as you know, the government agreed to take the position at sentencing that a below-quidelines sentence was appropriate for Ms. Urbanek because of everything that happened including her domestic situation, but we didn't feel compelled to do that here.

With respect to the other defendants that were sentenced by some of the other judges in the courthouse, Mr. Vago was sentenced at 366 days, so a year and a day. was a tax preparer and it makes sense. His quidelines are higher and he played a more significant role and no one is suggesting that 13 months' imprisonment here would necessarily be the right term of imprisonment, although it's certainly within the guidelines.

Mr. Nolan was the corrupt DOL employee, he got an 18-month sentence. Mr. Choudry got a 24-month sentence. Again he was someone who worked at the law firm. Ms. Diaz, she was an attorney, I think this was probably the outlier sentence and she had personal circumstances including care of a minor child as the sole provider, so I think that that is likely what drove the decision to impose probation on her.

Ms. Sitao -- I'm sure I'm pronouncing that wrong --

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

had a significant number of applications, approximately 34 applications, was sentenced to 15 months' imprisonment and then Mr. Hussein and Mr. Saleem both provided various services. Mr. Hussein worked at the law firm, Mr. Saleem was one of the accountants, although he only did tax returns for a single company which I think accounts for his probationary sentence, whereas Mr. Hussein got a 13-month sentence as someone who worked at the law firm.

So when you lay out and compare the relative roles of Mr. Weber and the other defendants I mentioned the guidelines particularly because they allow for a split sentence of home confinement and some incarceration seem to be appropriate both in terms of looking at them on their face and in terms of the relative roles of the defendants here. I think probably the most difficult thing, at least as I was looking at it, to balance it is the level of charitable works that Mr. Weber has done in his life, the number of supporting letters, the amount of community support that he has certainly weighs in his favor and perhaps that augers for not a full ten-month imprisonment sentence and the split sentence being the appropriate sentence, but certainly the government does believe that a guidelines sentence here is appropriate, notwithstanding the charitable works and taking that into account because of the several things that Mr. Weber did, because of the not just lending his name but opening P.O. boxes, the additional -- well, again, I

don't mean to call it additional criminal conduct, it was additional criminal conduct for Mr. Greenstein but part and parcel of this was Mr. Weber was perfectly willing to continue the fraud among the law firm.

THE COURT: And you have some independent evidence in addition to Mr. Greenstein's testimony about, I think the company was named something like Immigration Consultants.

MR. PASTORE: It was something along those lines,

North American Immigration Consultants, something along those

lines. May I have a moment to speak with Mr. Gibbs?

THE COURT: He can sit with you.

MR. PASTORE: He apologizes, he did not dress appropriately.

So, your Honor, completely separate and apart from the two aliens that Mr. Greenstein assisted along with Mr. Weber the agents interviewed two different aliens who reported meeting with Mr. Weber and apparently, and I say apparently, it looks like money was taken from those aliens but applications never were filed because we didn't find, the agents didn't find any applications in the system. So the aliens reported paying money but we didn't see a corresponding Department of Labor immigration application. It's difficult to prove a negative, but it appears that the money may have been pocketed.

So in addition to Mr. Greenstein's testimony about his

two aliens, the agents corroborated Mr. Weber doing additional applications by talking to two people who actually were serviced.

THE COURT: I'll hear from Ms. Nechlis now.

MS. NECHLIS: Thank you, your Honor. Your Honor, I'm surprised by the government's statements here today.

Mr. Pastore was not involved in our negotiations with Ms. Perry and Ms. Echenberg about this plea and there were extensive negotiations, they went over many months. We discussed all these allegations and we told the government that we disagreed with them, that there was no money taken and we reached an agreement with the government, we were going to plead guilty to certain things and it would be a stipulation as to what the conduct was. Notably the government did not respond to our sentencing memo and did not put any of this in writing. So we had gone through all of this, but this was never put before the Court. We were never, we never briefed this to your Honor. So to come in today —

THE COURT: Do you want an adjournment?

MS. NECHLIS: No, I don't, your Honor. I think that these — there was a reason why we reached the stipulation and the government reached the stipulation that they stipulated to. They stipulated to what the conduct was. So to at this point be raising other conduct is really kind of surprising. And we gave them our sentencing memorandum before we submitted it to

Sentence

1

2

3

4 5

6

7

8

9

10 11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20 21

22

23

24

25

the Court to make sure that we were aware there had been a trial on this, that they had done an extensive investigation to be sure that we were not saying something about the conduct that the government found offensive. We e-mailed it to them and we discussed it with them before we submitted it to the Court. And none of this was raised before today.

So there's a couple of levels of this. One is the number of people. Before we entered into these stipulations with the government we had extensive discussions about the number of applications. We showed the government that on many of the applications that Mr. Weber supposedly signed his name was spelled wrong. It had the wrong Social Security number. There were so many inaccuracies. He never signed those documents. His name was forged on them. It was based on this back and forth. So, yes, there are many documents which listed his name, but they clearly, he clearly was not actually involved in those documents.

THE COURT: Well, one of the things that I've learned by spending over three weeks at trial is that while that was true in many of the cases, that the sponsors did not personally sign the applications, nonetheless the correspondence from the government in response to the applications had to go back to the sponsor, and so you have, let's say, a situation where you have this post office box, and whether or not Mr. Weber or some other sponsor signed the application, there becomes an

awareness from the fact that there then -- there's mail from the Department of Labor, there are phone calls --

MS. NECHLIS: Judge, I want to be a hundred percent clear here. We are not contesting in any way his responsibility. He pled guilty and we've accepted responsibility.

THE COURT: Well, it's very important --

MS. NECHLIS: But what I'm saying is there were a number of post office boxes. Some of them went to him. The ones he had actual businesses, he had actual nursing homes, he had an employment agency. He opened post office boxes in connection with those. He did. He opened those post office boxes. Mail did go to him. He got some of this stuff. He knew what was going on. He's not saying he wasn't involved or he didn't do it. But we showed —

THE COURT: But there's a great --

MS. NECHLIS: We went through a lot of the specifics. We spent a lot of time going through the documents and showed after that, we showed the government that some of these documents could never have gone to him, he didn't see. So, yes, there were 300-something applications, but we agreed with the government that the best estimate of what he personally was responsible for was up to I believe it was to 99.

THE COURT: Well, that number, as you know and I know, just comes from the guidelines book and there is, guidelines

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

book or no quidelines book, an enormous difference from my point of view, and I think there ought to be, whether the number is 25 or it's 99 or it's really 150 or 125, but the government as part of plea negotiations says we're going to put you in another quidelines category. So, you know --

MR. PASTORE: Your Honor, I do want to be clear when I was talking to my colleague Ms. Echenberg, there were, of those 199 that I mentioned there were some that Mr. Weber could not have known about, so we credited defense counsel's arguments and that's why we agreed on the 25 to 99, one of the reasons we agreed on the 25 to 99 and no one is suggesting that --

THE COURT: No, I understood you.

MR. PASTORE: I just wanted to make that clear that we're not backing away from that number. We heard what defense counsel -- again, I wasn't involved in those negotiations, but I understand that it was negotiated very hard that number and there was a pretty convincing presentation made about why the number should be lower for several reasons.

THE COURT: Okay, but from my perspective it does matter whether it's at the low end or the high end of that number and if you have a situation where the potential universe is 305, there's a huge difference just in mathematical terms whether the real number is a third or the real number is -well, let me -- a twelfth and one would logically think it's not a twelfth, it's something higher than that.

MS. NECHLIS: Your Honor, if I may respectfully. I think nobody was able to say where it was between the 25 and the hundred, the 99; that clearly he got mail on this stuff, he got documents. He received documents over the years. Some of the documents went to his post office box. He appears to have signed very few of the documents himself. But he did get the mail. He knew that this was going on. He knew that his firm was being — his companies were being used on an ongoing basis and he did nothing about it over time and then after he did have some involvement with Immigration Associates. We went back and forth with the government over this issue of whether there were other immigrants he took money from. We disputed that. We said we did not believe it ever occurred and the government as we understood it dropped that out of any consideration. That was not to be part of today.

THE COURT: Let me make something perfectly clear. On the yellow piece of paper in front of me with my questions is the following note: David G. for Greenstein, Immigration

Consultants. I was going to ask him whether he volunteered it or not because we did something not very sophisticated but we reviewed the trial transcript with an index to find all the references to Mr. Weber. So we found it. So it wasn't that I remembered it, frankly, but we found it.

MS. NECHLIS: As did I, your Honor. And there's no -Immigration Associates, I understand. But what I'm surprised

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

by today is the allegation about theft from other immigrants. Not the two applications that were put in through Immigration Associates but the allegation that money was stolen from other people, which is something that we had extensive discussions about with the government before this case and so that we would want a hearing about it. We asked for the names of the people. We disputed it. So to hear it now when they did not put it in any memorandum, it was not part of the testimony, I'm frankly surprised that it is coming up today, and it was not part of the agreement, it was not part of the sentencing, it was never -- it was something we always told the government, no, that did not occur. That is not what occurs here. But you don't dispute that Mr. Weber was THE COURT: himself involved in some company, organization called Immigration Consultants which had activities that were not dissimilar from the scheme involving Earl David, right? MS. NECHLIS: My understanding, your Honor, was that there were two times that his firm was used as a sponsor at that point as well. And that this fit well within the whole sort of 25 to 99 for --THE COURT: Was Immigration Consultants a sponsoring company? MS. NECHLIS: No. THE COURT: It was a feeder company, right?

No.

MS. NECHLIS:

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

THE COURT: No?

MS. NECHLIS: My understanding about it was Immigration Associates, one of the things that it did was you were allowed under the regulations to bring, you're allowed to assist people filling out applications and so that's what that company, that was one of the roles it did. It also on a couple of occasions my understanding is helped people with phony applications where another one of Mr. Weber's companies was used as the sponsor, and with respect to that, that was part of the allocution in his case, that was part of the 25 to 99 cases that the government had considered, that we had extensive discussions about. He allocuted specifically to that as well. That was part of our concern that that be covered in the allocution here and it was agreed to that that was part of this whole scheme, the same scheme, the 25 to 99 here. So this is not, it's not some additional amount that went on. part of the negotiations with the companies.

THE COURT: But isn't the more salient point that even after Earl David fled to Canada, that did not totally discourage Mr. Weber in continuing to be involved in this fraudulent activity?

MR. PASTORE: Yes, and, your Honor, just to make the record clear, although we've mentioned it, based on what I'm hearing from defense counsel, we're not going to in any way rely on the allegation of theft as a sentencing factor. The

D2EFWEBS

purpose of bringing the other immigration firm up was exactly what your Honor just said. The salient point was that even after Earl David leaves there's applications being filled out by this company that it sounds like there's no dispute that Mr. Weber was involved in that company and that additional phony applications were filed through it. So we will explicitly not rely on any allegation of theft to avoid any problems.

THE COURT: Actually, the reason that I asked you the question was there some independent evidence was to confirm or be sure that what Mr. Greenstein had said was correct and honest. So that was why I asked that. I can tell you that in candor.

MS. NECHLIS: Your Honor, with respect to Mr. David's fleeing, I do not believe that at that point — it's a funny thing. He flees, Mr. Weber knew he was doing something wrong. He knew it before, he knew it after. He left. He was doing something wrong by allowing his name. I don't think he focused on the significance or how wrong this was. I guess that sort of standing here today, I don't think that Mr. David fleeing, it's not like the witness who had pled guilty and continued on, was in a cooperation agreement and continued to do wrong. I think of it all as just a continuum. It's not like we're saying before he fled he didn't know he was doing something wrong. He knew he was doing something wrong here, he should

Sentence

not have allowed his company to be used, his name to be used. And he knew that even though he was only doing a portion others were doing more and that this is what that law firm was doing. Immigration Associates also did legitimate work, legitimate help to try to get immigrants who were legitimate immigrants to try to assist them in getting their papers in or their applications put in. You don't need to be a lawyer to be able to do this, to assist people in this kind of work. But he also knew that he was doing something wrong with respect to being a sponsor for these things. But in that sense I do not believe that he is in any different position than the other sponsors or defendants who have been sentenced by your Honor.

THE COURT: I can tell you that the, and I went back over it because you made the argument, as did Mr. Herbst's counsel, I did review all the other sentences and Mr. Pastore may look at it from one perspective, but my perspective was apart from the degree of involvement in kind of a measurable way there were in my view certain family circumstances and other situations that were particularly compelling to me. So I assure you that I have, and I always try to sentence as proportionately as possible. Whether it's perfect or not I can't, you know, that I can't guarantee you.

Let me ask you about some other matters that I find pretty troubling, and let me just put -- we can totally put to one side the issue of whether Mr. Weber has engaged in

D2EFWEBS Sentence

exceptional charitable activity. I'm not questioning that.

But there are things that concern me. As you're aware,

paragraph 69 of the probation report states that the defendant

was instructed to complete and return a personal financial

affidavit to the Probation Office. To date we have not

received a personal affidavit from the defendant or defense

counsel and as you know I had my law clerk call you to obtain

that affidavit, which as I said earlier I got this morning.

It's dated yesterday. So it's not like you gave me a Xerox of

something that had been previously submitted.

The information in this affidavit, which I would not have known had my eye not caught the absence of one given to probation, makes the paragraph 69 information wholly misleading and fundamentally bottom line untrue. For example, it says that Mr. Weber had \$240 cash on hand. Well, I don't know, maybe that was what was in his pocket at that moment, but if we look at his net worth statement, and it's a tough Xerox so I may not have the numbers quite right, but he has over \$2,500 in bank accounts, he has brokerage accounts that sort of looks like approaching \$50,000. He has cash value on life insurance policies. He has other assets.

MS. NECHLIS: Your Honor, your Honor may not be aware, the presentence report was given to us very late in this case, so it was given to us on the, it was given to us I believe last week and we went ahead with sentencing because I have a trial

coming up and wanted to -- didn't want to adjourn this until after sentencing. However, my colleague, Mr. Shelanski, talking to the probation officer all along, he was busy on some other things and had said, had been told we would submit this report two or three weeks earlier and that we could put in the financial affidavit afterwards. And then things got sped up and we did not put the financial information in. The presentence report was submitted and the --

THE COURT: But the whole thing is I've only caught you in the falsehood because I asked for it and the fact is that what he says in here is totally misleading.

MS. NECHLIS: All right.

THE COURT: And it's so grossly inaccurate and when you go past that and then you learn that, you know, the portrayal of somebody who --

MS. NECHLIS: Could I address what's in the financial report and what's in the PSR? Because I'm troubled by this, because I don't see it as that different.

THE COURT: Oh, he has \$240 cash on hand, but he has four bank accounts, brokerage accounts, these are all what we call, you know, cash or cash equivalents.

MS. NECHLIS: Okay. Your Honor, three of those accounts are his wife's. They're not his. So when he answered what was in his account, what he had, he was accurate. It turns out his wife had about \$3,000 more, but he had \$250 in

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

his	account	as	of	the	date	last	night.	So	Ι	don't	think	that
that's inaccurate.												

With respect to his, the securities, one of those accounts is his. The KEOGH, the \$30,000 one. The other two which have about, I don't know, \$14,000 or \$13,000 are -- no, one more is his, it has another 3,000 that he omitted to tell probation, but the other 10,000 is his wife's, it's not his.

THE COURT: The question is, include all stocks -- MS. NECHLIS: He did.

THE COURT: -- and public companies you own or have an interest in.

MS. NECHLIS: No, or your spouse owns.

THE COURT: Where does it say that?

MS. NECHLIS: If you look at the top it says, note, you should put individual, joint or spouses.

THE COURT: Okay, I see it now.

MS. NECHLIS: On the front page the instructions say not only your assets should be listed but also your spouse's assets.

THE COURT: Fair enough.

MS. NECHLIS: In fact, his house is being foreclosed on. He has no money. He has 30,000, the only money he'll be left with --

THE COURT: But his house is being foreclosed on because he chose to take out an enormous mortgage on his house

and his house, according to this, is still worth more than the mortgage amount that's outstanding.

MS. NECHLIS: You know, your Honor, we tried in this financial statement to be really cautious. I was sort of taken by surprise that this had not been given to probation. Things had moved quickly. We tried to be very cautious and not understate his assets in any way, in any way. Because to me that would be the problem, to be coming in here and have put in an affidavit that falsely understated it. It never occurred to me that there was a question that it somehow contradicted what he previously told probation. I don't think it significantly contradicted it and certainly we weren't trying to hide any of this. We put it all in the financial statement. I think to a large extent it does reflect what was told to probation.

Really, his main assets is his 30,000 in an IRA account. His wife has some other assets, there's a trust for the grandchildren.

THE COURT: What is that trust? I wanted to ask you.

MS. NECHLIS: It's money he will inherit when his father passes away. We tried to list everything, your Honor. That is not money he has access to. That is money that he will inherit, I'm not sure — the grandchildren will inherit, not him. So it's not money that he controls, but part of the instructions here are, you know, people —

THE COURT: It's his daughter or all --

MS. NECHLIS: His daughters. So we really tried to be very -- I mean, I'm always concerned. I don't want my clients making a false statement in these documents so I say overstate if you have to your assets; if you're guessing, say, put it on the high side, you know, but --

THE COURT: I also, I'll be perfectly candid with you. There's a couple of your letters talk about the bar mitzvah that he gave to the young man Mordechai, and it is described as no expense or detail was spared. If my math is right that was about four years ago?

MS. NECHLIS: Five years ago, your Honor.

THE COURT: 13, Mordechai says he's 17.

MS. NECHLIS: He's 18. I think he was 17 when he wrote the letter. He's 18 now.

Your Honor, I just have two things to say about that.

I do want to talk further about Mordechai because I think that
goes to the heart of sort of the --

THE COURT: How about just throw in there when you discuss it the fact that in 2009 after throwing this bash he then filed for bankruptcy.

MS. NECHLIS: So, your Honor probably noticed as well that Mr. Weber's father has been paying the tuition for Mordechai for school for all of this year and his father is a wealthy man and he paid my fees and has paid most of these things. So he is the one who has been providing a lot of the

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

D2EFWEBS

support here. In addition -- and he's very close to Mordechai He has been supporting Mordechai. He has become part as well. of his family, so this is essentially his foster grandson who is being bar mitzvahed in what is a very important thing about this child. But in addition, I don't know whether your Honor has been to any bar mitzvahs in this community. No expense spared is not like an upper west side bar mitzvah. This is not at the Plaza. These are in schul with, you know, lavish food set out, but this is not dancing all night at some fancy hotel. This is not \$100,000 bar mitzvah. That is not what impresses in that community.

So when I read this, it did not even occur to me that it was an expensive thing. I've been to beautiful weddings in this community where it's all in schul. It's not -- everybody is invited, there's plenty of food, but I can't imagine it costs that much money. It doesn't cost what my friend's kids' bat mitzvahs and bar mitzvahs cost because it's a different community, a different thing is important. What's important is on the day of his birthday, on his birthday is when the bar mitzvah happens at 9:00 at night. Often it's only the men there or maybe some other people, but it's not that you have it Saturday afternoon in schul sometime near the birthday and then you go -- so I actually had not asked, you know -- and then you have a big party at night. That's not what happens here.

So I hadn't even asked about this so I can't tell you,

your Honor, how much it costs because having been to these kind of bar mitzvahs hearing that, they're not fancy. They're not like our bar -- my kid's bat mitzvah is going to be, which I will try to do modest, but it will probably cost three times what his foster son's bar mitzvah costs because to them what is important is praying for hours and the significance of this child getting up on the bima and praying for hours.

So I read that as talking, what to me was the significance was he got this kid the education, he put it all together, he got him the clothing that was needed. But I don't even know if there was dancing, I don't know if there was, what there was. It's not --

THE COURT: I'm just reading what Mordechai's mother said. "A year later when Mordechai turned 13 he took care of his bar mitzvah celebration and no expense or detail was spared. It is now five years later and everybody is still ranting and raving about it."

MS. NECHLIS: I don't know what she meant.

THE COURT: I don't know what she meant, either.

MS. NECHLIS: I'm told it cost about \$4,000, your Honor, the bar mitzvah. I don't know why she says everybody is still ranting and raving. I'm really — these are, a bar mitzvah in this community is not a big dance affair, it's not where the kids get brought in on elephants.

THE COURT: I think I understand that. I am just

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Sentence

reading what is in a letter that you submitted and there is an interesting to me sequence of reading the letter and then thinking about the fact that Mr. Weber, who is obviously the son of an extremely, very wealthy -- I don't want to say "extremely" -- a very wealthy person, decides, chooses to file for bankruptcy thereby taking advantage of the civil law and not paying the civil debts that he accumulated.

MS. NECHLIS: I could address that, your Honor. Mr. Weber had a number of nursing homes in Connecticut and some other businesses, and the rates changed for reimbursement. floundered. He didn't do well. He's not a very good businessman. And it failed and there were enormous debts associated with that. And, yes, he then took advantage of the laws that allowed him to file for bankruptcy and that's what he did and he filed for bankruptcy.

THE COURT: There's a difference between business bankruptcy and personal.

MS. NECHLIS: I think his business and personal were intertwined. He had taken personal loans out to invest in the business. He lad tried to make these businesses succeed. He failed at it. And so because -- at that point he filed for bankruptcy for it. But I don't think there's any allegation anywhere that he did something improper in that respect. And in addition I don't think there's any allegation that he lives an extravagant lifestyle or had done anything, hidden assets or

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Sentence

had done anything phony.

I mean, in this entire net worth statement here there just isn't that much there. Even when you count in his wife's assets there's just, you know, it's another \$10,000 in cash. You know, at the same time this is a man who has taken on extraordinary responsibility for two other foster children, bringing them into his life, greatly increasing his expenses in what he's doing. Because it's an expensive lifestyle. It's expensive to send these children to Yeshivas, to private schools. You've read these letters that all of these children got extensive psychological care, that the two children he took in, they were children very much in need. But it's not, really in all of this when I was putting together the letters and putting all of this together, I never really focused on the money, your Honor, because respectfully, he's poor. He has almost nothing. He walks around with plastic bags with things. I've never seen him dressed well.

THE COURT: But they're all the letters of all of the things that he is providing to these charities, where is it coming from?

MS. NECHLIS: Much of it is him going and doing things there, helping, setting things up. Yes, some of it is him giving money, but, and I don't know when that is from. Some of it is him buying clothing for people in his community on the holidays or stuff. I don't know that that is that much money

1 to be putting out, you know. I mean, you see also in his 2 financial statements he gets money. He's supported by his 3 father for the most part. His father has helped him. Does he 4 give some of his money away? It is an enormously charitable 5 family. His father, who is wealthy, has also done unbelievable 6 charitable acts. He organized and established, he was the 7 founder of Hatzolah, the ambulance service that is worldwide now that is a volunteer ambulance service and he gives millions 8 9 of dollars and has given millions of dollars to that and he 10 gives to other charities and that is sort of the model that 11 Mr. Weber has tried to live with, and so he does give money to 12 charity, he does do it, and, your Honor, honestly, I actually, 13 when I looked at this letter, it is a community that is, this 14 community is very much, part of it is to do these different 15 charitable acts, caring for the sick, caring for the dead. You've seen it in other cases I'm sure. To me what is 16 17 different about this case and when I came into court tonight and what I have been thinking about for days is what is done 18 19 with these children, the two children he fosters and the Ungers 20 who also wrote letters to you as well where they talked about, 21 people in the community talk about his bringing into his home, 22 he and his wife Panina bringing kids into his home who came 23 from extremely troubled homes, and particularly this woman, 24 there was a letter from Gitty Manson who talks about this 25 child, their childhood friend Raizi, who was just a mess. She

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

came from a horrible family, an abusive family, she went to live with grandparents who were Holocaust survivors, always a problematic situation. Then she married an abusive alcoholic man and then has this child who clearly has psychological problems, ADD, anger management issues, the stealing things from the community, is in trouble, nobody can do anything. There are many organizations that are trying to help him with this boy in the community, nobody would take him in. I can't imagine as a mother trying to take in someone else's child like this, taking on that kind of responsibility. But he and his wife, Panina, who is here in the courtroom did that and have done it not just this last year, not just for a few months, but for years now, for over five years. I think it's six or seven years with this boy. Before that they did it with another boy. These boys have written to your Honor and other people have written to your Honor about how he did that.

Those to me are just extraordinary acts and go far deeper. Yes, he gave money to this kid, yes, but the amount of time and devotion and caring and patience that you would have to have with boys like this who are on the verge of just becoming delinquents, just being drug addicts, thieves, being in serious, serious trouble and there's just no question that that was where Mordechai is. You have many, many letters from that. So you see with all of that that that is really what I think he has done here, you know, and then even more you see,

Document 238

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

and I didn't really focus on this before, but if you're going back and looking through the letters there are these other two boys who live next door, the Ungers, who also talk about how he has taken them in. They have no father around either. It is a community where sexes are very segregated and a boy needs a father, a boy needs a man to help him get bar mitzvahed, help him in a community like this. The rabbis will take care of some of it in the community but Mr. Weber has stepped up to the

plate on this with these children and two others as well.

So with respect to Mordechai's bar mitzvah, I think it occurred in 2008, before he declared bankruptcy, it's hard for me to imagine a that it was a very lavish affair. Yes, I see that that sentence is in Mordechai's mother letter. the woman who is described by everybody else as being a little crazy, a bit, you know, as being a troubled, troubled woman which is why her child is not with her, why Mr. Weber and his wife have been raising --

THE COURT: Explain to me why somebody who is the son of a multimillionaire who engages in exceptional charitable works, has a clear sense of family, of community, is willing to break the civil law. The civil law, what I mean by that is broadly the non-religious law, in this case the criminal part of the law. It is -- there is a disconnect there that I really don't comprehend.

MS. NECHLIS: So, I agree with that, your Honor, that

D2EFWEBS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

is the most challenging part of this case. I do believe that Mr. Weber is a really good person, a really good person who did something wrong here. I think he did something wrong for a couple of reasons, you know, having spent a long time with him, with his family. I know a lot of his family members over the years and with him I think that he's had a lot of health issues, he had a tremendous failing in his business. He is not the success of his father, of his brothers, maybe, he is not the success. In other ways he is, in his personal life he is a tremendous success in his business he is not, he is really kind of a failure there. I think he was floundering, he was looking for things to do, looking for business. He doesn't have a job, he's a messenger essentially today. He is supported by his father.

He became friends with some people at this law firm, he started off working for them legitimately, they said to him here's an easy way to get money, these are people who just need to come into the country, it's no big deal. And it is a big I don't mean to say that, that it's not a big deal. It deal. is a big deal, it was wrong to do it. But I think he disregarded how wrong it was. He didn't think of it as a big deal. He's not stealing money, he's just helping people come into the country. And I think he just did something stupid, he didn't think of it as that significant and he did something stupid, maybe because he was in a very hard part of his life, a

bad time in his life, maybe because he's not the success of other people, maybe because he's having health problems and problems that we talk about in his submission, in our submission to your Honor, but there is often no good reason why somebody does something that was just wrong and uncharacteristic.

It is not, what I would say, though, it is not a situation, sometimes you'll get a situation where it's pervasive in someone's lifestyle that they are on the one hand religious, but on the other hand they're defrauding the government out of benefits. They're not paying their taxes. They're doing this — that's not what went on here at all. This is a man who I believe has led a righteous life, who thinks, who is not a cheat or dishonest person, but who did this thing and it was wrong. It went on.

I don't think he made a lot of money out of it.

Somehow the government was alleging he got \$100 a transaction. He didn't have a lot of money. He's not a success and I think he was trying to find a new way, maybe I can do this immigration business, maybe I can start that as a business. In fact, at one point he was asking me is this okay, can we do this, can I help people with this, here are the regulations. He has no place to -- he was lost, and so none of that is meant to justify it, to say that this was in any way okay, but it was just I feel a failing.

MR. PASTORE: Judge, just very briefly. In terms of, so defense counsel has raised this idea of paying taxes. I'm just looking at paragraph 70 and it doesn't appear that he's paid any taxes from 2007 to 2011, since his taxable income is zero. I'm not sure how that is if he was employed earning \$400 a week during that time period. And it looks like maybe negative income was reported for 2007 and 2008. I don't know if the parenthesis indicate negative income or not. The tax on the return for one year in 2007 is \$1,266, the taxable income is zero. Taxable income is zero in each of those years. I'm not really sure of what's going on there but I raise it only because the tax issue was brought up.

Second, with respect to the mortgage, it looks like essentially equity was stripped out of the home and then it was allowed to go into foreclosure. The purchase price of the home, if you look at --

THE COURT: I'm very familiar with that part. Yes, the purchase price is around --

MR. PASTORE: 255, but then you have a mortgage in excess or close to a half million dollars and then on the other page it looks like there's a home equity line of credit and I'm not, I have no idea what was in that loan application. I know from my experience in the white collar unit that equity stripping is something that folks do to get money when they don't intend to pay it back. I have no --

THE COURT: Well, I mean --

MS. NECHLIS: Judge, I don't know why Mr. Pastore would have just said that with no knowledge of it. Yes, that happens. That has no applicability here. This money, my understanding, was taken out a number of years ago to help fund his businesses. That's what I was saying before, that his personal, he took money to try to save his business, to try to make his businesses — people often do that in small businesses. It wasn't a stripping recently of money taken out. And in fact, I don't even know that you could get a home equity loan today, that he could get a home equity loan in the last three years.

When I say he has always paid his taxes and is not a tax cheat, he doesn't make enough money to pay taxes at the end of the year, but he's declaring his income and just as there's this whole debate about what it means to not pay — he's paying taxes. He's paying taxes on his income. He's paying his Social Security tax. He is not earning money. His income is very low, so he's not paying a tax rate that's high, but he's paying taxes and he's not illegally declaring — that's my only point here. It's not a case where somebody is coming in, I kind of find it shocking that prosecutor comes in here and says he's not paying his taxes. He's being investigated, there's allegations. He hasn't done anything else wrong. To come in and say well, maybe this is stripping, to have these kind of

allegations thrown up like this at sentencing with no basis and the prosecutor then says, well, I don't have any basis for saying, then don't say it. Don't say it. It's wrong. We're sentencing a man here today, and to suggest that maybe --

THE COURT: Let me say that had you put your financial affidavit in timely I think it would have been a lot, this presentence report would have reflected the numbers that finally appear because I asked for it.

MS. NECHLIS: I understand, but can I say, the government knew about this bankruptcy, they knew about it. We discussed it with the government when we were negotiating the plea.

THE COURT: That may be.

MS. NECHLIS: No, I understand your Honor didn't, but the prosecutors did. I never heard any allegation that there was any fraud or anything wrong. There wasn't anything wrong. Your Honor, I think that, I do believe that Mr. Weber is an extraordinary man. I think that to have saved these two children's lives and also the Unger boys, taken them in, is the kind of conduct that you almost never see somebody do. When we talk about, when people think about adopting a child or taking a child in for foster care, it's a very hard thing to do. As parents we all know that. We know how hard it is to raise our own children with their own problems, but to take in someone else's problem child and children like this who everybody knows

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

are problem children, these are the kids that never get placed.

And for him to have taken in, it is really just extraordinary.

I think he is an extraordinary man who did something wrong here, and more than that, your Honor, I think that when your Honor talked about home circumstances and circumstances that -- extraordinary home circumstances that I believe is what the PSR was addressing, what they specifically talk about there as to why probation is the right sentence in this case. You have letters from Mordechai's, from his doctor who has written to your Honor and told your Honor that this is a boy who is at risk still, even though he is now 18 years old. He is at risk. His school, his principal has written from the Yeshiva to talk about here is a boy who is at risk. Others have written about how Mordechai is still very much a boy who does not, a juvenile who is behind on things and has been acting out, is under a lot He's not here today because he -- because there was a worry in the family that what would happen to this boy if he comes here today and this kind of stress of him actually seeing what was going on here. He knows about it, but to actually be put in this situation. But it's not his doctor, it's a quidance counselor who has written your Honor, I think it was Exhibit 5, from Mordechai Landau who gave your Honor his phone number and has talked about how he has worked with this boy as he's grown into a teenager and he says that, "I've worked with this child as he's grown into a teenager. Mayer Weber and his

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Document 238

D2EFWEBS Sentence

wife has raised them on his own paying for his schools." As you know from other letters that was paid for by Mr. Weber's father, as well as all the other services that this child Now, "Not having Mr. Weber around as his father would cause irreparable damage to Mordechai. Mordechai is deeply attached to Mr. Weber who he accepts as his father."

Mordechai writes in his letter to your Honor as well about just how important this family relationship is and how he doesn't talk about all the horrible things that happened to him in the way that Getty has written to your Honor, about how he would be beaten, how he would be walking his father home drunk on the streets on shabbot, how other people would see it, how he started stealing so he could hang out in a store hoping to see his father in a store after his father deserted the family. But he does talk about no one who was home to feed him, to bathe him, to do anything for him, and then he found the Webers who took him in and brought him up, and how in all the things that they have done for him, and he says I need this man in my life. He is a boy who, he's 18 now, but 18 is still young. mean, it's not so young in that community but he's young enough so that they're not looking to get married yet. Some think that in that community they marry very young, but there's been no thought of trying to place this boy in that situation because he's really just not together enough. He needs Mr. Weber and it really has been extraordinary what Mr. Weber

Sentence

has done here.

We recognize the wrongdoing that Mr. Weber did. He made very little money from this wrongdoing, which, of course, doesn't really capture the significance of what he did wrong. That's why that was not part of our argument, but it wasn't a crime of greed, it was really a crime of stupidity and we ask that your Honor sentence him to probation, to a period of probation and if you see fit community service as well, but I do believe that this is a indication as strong as any I've ever seen of extraordinary family circumstances.

THE COURT: Mr. Weber, we've been talking a lot about you, and this is your chance to speak on your own behalf.

THE DEFENDANT: I'm deeply sorry what I did, you heard everything, you saw all the letters, you saw everything. I'm deeply sorry what I did, I messed up.

THE COURT: Can you explain to me why you did what you did?

THE DEFENDANT: I was in -- I had two nursing homes in Connecticut and I bought them, I raised my own money, I refinanced my house then. That's exactly the date when I refinanced it was in 2002. That's when I bought the nursing homes. I lost over \$2 million my own money. Nobody helped me with that. I had -- my dad helped me and when I lost money, he's helping me throughout just to pay my bills now. Further on, I had a problem why I filed for bankruptcy. I had a major

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

D2EFWEBS Sentence

I paid the mortgages for several years, until 2001 problem. both mortgages, I paid it every month. I filed for bankruptcy in '09. I had with the IRS settlement, I owed them money, I paid them \$109,000, your Honor. I'm not a scapegoat, I paid. I have an agreement, I paid it. I have copies of a certified check and I paid the IRS up and I have a satisfaction note from I'm not a -- I filed every year my taxes. government has a copy of my tax return. I'm not a crook. This is what I earn.

Now, to your main question why I did this, it's exactly what my attorney says that's the truth. I've been struggling, I'm trying to make a go, something out of it, not to sit around being depressed, to make a go of something since I lost my literally life savings and my hope since I had these two nursing homes. And again, I'm sorry. I messed up.

THE COURT: All right. We're just going to take a brief break.

(Recess).

MS. NECHLIS: Your Honor, if I could just make one more statement?

THE COURT: Sure.

MS. NECHLIS: I'm concerned because I feel that it was my firm's fault that this financial statement was not submitted in a timely matter. My understanding, I was on trial in another matter and my understanding that the documents

underlying it were given to probation but we hadn't filled out the form and we didn't tell the client afterwards, he had asked us is there anything else he needed to do. I'm told that he was told no, there was nothing else, and it wasn't until a couple of days ago that we focused on the fact that we had not submitted this financial statement. So I would like to take responsibility for that, your Honor, and to let you know that as you're inquiring about it I am told that it was my firm's fault that this was not submitted before. We didn't think it was an issue. If we thought it was an issue we would have asked for more time for sentencing so everybody could be comfortable.

THE COURT: Let me say the reason it's an issue -- I'm not -- I think that many of the questions I have about it have essentially been satisfied. I had an experience in connection with another sentencing some years ago where after I sentenced the defendant, fortuitously we did a Google search to see, looking to see what the coverage was of the sentencing, which revealed that the defendant indeed had an outstanding judgment to the SEC in a huge amount of money and I couldn't understand how that was a piece of information that I hadn't known. So when I contacted the probation department and asked and said don't you -- where's this guy's financial statement, don't you ask about these things, it turned out that it had been flippantly, deliberately flippantly not filled out completely

IEBS Sentence

and as a consequence you may notice, you may be aware because you've been practicing a long time, it now requires the defendant to initial every page. That is a consequence of my experience. So therefore, when I saw that no financial affidavit had been filed, and there's some other financial issues with the next defendant, it set off bells for me, okay? And that's why I look for it.

MS. NECHLIS: I understand.

THE COURT: And then I admit that I didn't fully accurately read it, which then caused me to have concern that it was quite inconsistent with what had been disclosed which was, of course, the experience I had had some years ago.

MS. NECHLIS: I would just ask that if your Honor has any further concerns, because it was my fault, that we just have an adjournment so I could address anything that your Honor is concerned with.

THE COURT: Fine. I really don't think so. I think you've cleared up the bankruptcy timing issue. I think you cleared up the statement of assets in paragraph 69. I think you cleared up the million dollar trust issue. That was just something that I was curious about, and I think you also cleared up any concerns that might have lurked about tax returns. Okay. All right.

Obviously, any time that one spends close to two hours

I think now on a sentence indicates that it is a difficult one.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Sentence

As I said earlier, I endeavor not only to explore carefully the circumstances of the individual performing but also the circumstances of other people in the same case. I think that as we've discussed, there isn't any question that Mr. Weber presents with extraordinary charitable deeds, actually not too unlike a lot of the other defendants that have been sentenced here, including taking a child into the home, one of the other defendant's similar situation. And certainly Mr. Weber is entitled to consideration for that, and all of those deeds. Nonetheless, his involvement went on for a long time. admitted to seven years and a good number of applications, although I can't pin them down, the opening of the post office box and also his involvement with Immigration Consultants. Ιt. all leads to a decision that he should be placed on home confinement for three months.

Now, what I am uncertain about is whether that should be a condition of supervised release or a condition of probation. So I need a little guidance from counsel. I'm not sure -- I know how to structure it as a condition of supervised release, I'm not totally certain whether I can do it as a condition of probation. It is not material to me.

MS. NECHLIS: I don't think it's material to me either but I think that, I thought supervised release only follows incarceration.

THE COURT: Well, it could be time served. It could

always be time served, but the question is if I want to have the condition be home confinement can home confinement be a condition of probation or does it have to be a condition of supervised release.

MS. NECHLIS: Your Honor, I am embarrassed to say I cannot give a definitive answer. I thought it could be a condition of probation, but I'm not positive.

MR. PASTORE: Judge, I believe it can be a condition of probation, in this case probation while authorized by statute is not within guidelines, so it may just be easier, to the extent it matters to the Court, to do a sentence of time served with a special condition of supervised release —— I'm sorry, followed by supervised release with a special condition of three months' home confinement.

MS. NECHLIS: Judge, I really hate to do this, but does it make sense to adjourn this to consult with probation, the probation department as to what they, how they would like to do it? My only concern is that if it's supervised release is it, does it have to go through the prison system, does someone else have to supervise? How will it work?

THE COURT: No.

MR. PASTORE: No, it's just -- I'm just looking at the guidelines, by the way, your Honor, and guideline Section 5B1.1 does consider that imposition of a term of probation can include a special condition requiring intermittent confinement,

community confinement or home detention.

MS. NECHLIS: So we would ask for that, your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay, that's fine. All right. So I'm

going to place Mr. Weber on probation for 18 months with the

special condition of home confinement for three months.

There's a special assessment of \$100. The mandatory and standard conditions are imposed, and I'm not going to impose the community service condition because I really think it's unnecessary since I assumed he would continue to do what he does.

He may leave home to go to work. And I will also, he may also leave for religious services, but I would need you to send me a letter perhaps tomorrow or the next day. Tomorrow would be -- well, I may not sign the J and C for a while because I'm not going to be here next week, so it doesn't matter when you get it to me. I would like to have a specific request so I could respond to that.

MS. NECHLIS: And I would assume that that would start promptly so I wouldn't have to include the fall holidays, I would just assume that it will be starting promptly so I'll take whatever holidays are now into account and not the fall.

THE COURT: Certainly. I don't recall, but I assume that you waived any right to appeal.

Is there anything else? Are there any open counts?

MR. PASTORE: The government moves to dismiss any open

```
counts and underlying indictments against this defendant.
1
2
               THE COURT: All right. Thank you.
3
               MS. NECHLIS: Thank you, your Honor. Thank you for
 4
      your consideration.
               THE DEFENDANT: Thank you, your Honor.
5
6
               (Adjourned)
 7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```